## <u>Appeals</u>

## The following appeals have been received since my last report to Committee:

**APPEAL NO.** CAS-03175-P4C1C7 (2005)

**APPLICATION NO** P/23/577/FUL

APPELLANT MR D & MRS M JOHN

SUBJECT OF APPEAL TWO STOREY REAR AND SIDE EXTENSION; SINGLE STOREY

REAR EXTENSION; SIDE ENTRANCE PORCH AND WIDER

DRIVE ENTRANCE WITH DROPPED KERB -

RESUBMISSION OF REFUSED APPLICATION P/23/393/FUL:

32 MERTHYR MAWR ROAD BRIDGEND

**PROCEDURE** WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS

**DECISION LEVEL** DELEGATED OFFICER

The application was refused for the following reasons:

- 1. The proposed development, by reason of its siting, scale and design, would constitute an inappropriate and unsympathetic form of development that would unbalance and dominate the appearance of the established pair of semi-detached properties resulting in an unacceptable impact on the character of the host dwelling to the detriment of the existing visual amenities of the locality. As such, the proposal is considered contrary to Policy SP2 of the Bridgend Local Development Plan (2013), the principles of SPG2 Householder Development (2008) and Technical Advice Note 12 Design (2016), and advice contained within Planning Policy Wales (Edition 11, 2021).
- 2. The proposed two-storey side/rear extension, by reason of its siting, scale and design, would have an unreasonably overbearing impact on the neighbouring residential property, No. 30 Merthyr Mawr Road, to the detriment of the residential amenities enjoyed by the occupiers of that property. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy SP2 of the Bridgend Local Development Plan (2013) and the principles of Supplementary Planning Guidance 02: Householder Development (2008) and advice contained within Planning Policy Wales (Edition 11, 2021).

**APPEAL NO.** CAS-03246-Q8W1S8 (2006)

**APPLICATION NO** P/23/344/FUL

**APPELLANT** CARHYS

SUBJECT OF APPEAL SINGLE STOREY ONE BEDROOM BUNGALOW: LAND TO THE

SIDE OF 1 GER Y BONT BRIDGEND

PROCEDURE WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS

**DECISION LEVEL** DELEGATED OFFICER

The application was refused for the following reasons:

- The proposed dwelling, by reason of its siting, represents an uncharacteristic form of development which is at odds and harmful to the established character and appearance of the prevailing built up residential area contrary to Policy SP2 of the Local Development Plan (2013), Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 02 Householder Development and advice contained within Planning Policy Wales (Edition 11, February 2021).
- 2. The proposed development, by reason of its siting and design, represents an inappropriate form of development, which fails to provide future occupants with an appropriate and acceptable level of amenity, in terms of the outlook from the proposed dwelling, contrary to Policy SP2 of the Bridgend Local Development Plan, 2013, the principles of Supplementary Planning Guidance 02: Householder Development (2008) and advice contained within Planning Policy Wales (Edition 11, February 2021) and Future Wales the National Plan 2040 (Feb 2021).

**APPEAL NO.** CAS-03334-L5K8C7 (2007)

**APPLICATION NO** P/23/403/FUL

**APPELLANT** MR A MORGAN

**SUBJECT OF APPEAL** FIRST FLOOR SIDE AND PART FIRST FLOOR REAR

EXTENSION WITH ADDITIONAL GABLE AND PORCH TO FRONT

**ELEVATION: 86 TREMAINS COURT BRIDGEND** 

**PROCEDURE** WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS

**DECISION LEVEL** DELEGATED OFFICER

The application was refused for the following reason:

- 1. The proposed development, by reason of its size, scale and design, represents an excessive and overly prominent form of development that fails to respect the character and proportion of the host dwelling and adjoining dwellings, resulting in a significant detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the streetscene, contrary to Policy SP2 of the Local Development Plan (2013), Supplementary Planning Guidance 02 Householder Development (2008), and advice contained within Planning Policy Wales (Edition 11, 2021) and Technical Advice Note 12: Design (2016).
- 2. The proposed development, by reason of its scale, orientation and design, would have an excessively dominating impact on adjoining properties and would fill the space about the buildings resulting in a significant loss of residential amenity through overbearing and overshadowing impact contrary to Policy SP2 of the Local Development Plan (2013), Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 02 Householder Development and Paragraph 2.7 of Planning Policy Wales (Edition 12, 2024).

## RECOMMENDATION

That the report of the Corporate Director Communities be noted.

JANINE NIGHTINGALE
CORPORATE DIRECTOR COMMUNITIES

**Background Papers** (see application reference number)